

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Office Action mailed July 13, 2007.

Upon entry of this response, claims 1 – 8 and 22 – 26 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the indication that Applicant failed a requirement to comment on the allegedly generic species, as indicated in the restriction requirement of October 4, 2006. However, in an effort to advance prosecution, Applicant elects the following for searching purposes only. More specifically, for the “attractant” of claim 1, Applicant elects meat as an attractant for which the examiner can search. For the “trigger” of claim 1, Applicant elects any substance that is configured to dissolve in the range of 0.5 and 5 pH. For the subduing agent, Applicant elects any agent that may be configured to cause an energy release.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are not limited to these embodiments, but are elected for sole purposes of reducing the “searching burden” on the examiner. Applicant does note, however, that the MPEP requires that no such election or restriction be required, when the application can be searched and examined without undue burden on the examiner. Applicant believes this to be the case in the present application. As such, Applicant understands that, by making this restriction and election requirement, the examiner acknowledges that any reference used to reject the elected group and/or species will not be used to reject claims of other groups in any ensuing divisional application, because any such rejection would be tantamount to an admission that the examination of those claims could proceed with the current claims, with no undue burden on the examiner. Applicant submits that the various embodiments within these allegedly generic claims are not patentably obvious in view of one another and submit that claims 1 – 8 and 22 – 26 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500